DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 014 EA 022 750

AUTHOR Johnson, William L.; Snyder, Karolyn J.
TITLE Leadership for Productive Schools.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; *Administrator Role; Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; Leadership Training; Organizational Climate; *Principals; School Based Management; School Effectiveness; Staff Development

ABSTRACT

Given that current redefinition of the principalship emphasizes instructional leadership, this document begins with a summary of previous research findings on effective school characteristics related to school improvement planning, program development, staff development, school assessment, and organizational culture with emphasis throughout on the principal's role in creating effective schools. Second, a detailed description of the development and use of an instrument designed to assess the training needs for principals and district personnel is provided. Steps covered include the development of questionnaire forms, selection of respondents, administration of the instrument, and writing computer programs for assessment of the instrument reliability and validity. Ten leadership competency statements drawn from a synthesis of the responses of 247 elementary, middle, and secondary school principals and central office personnel in Texas are presented. These include statements on schoolwide goal setting, work group performance, individual staff performance, staff development, clinical supervision, work group development, quality control, the instructional program, resource development, and evaluation. One table is included. (92 references) (CLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329014

LEADERSHIP FOR PRODUCTIVE SCHOOLS

William L. Johnson, Ed.D.
Chairman, Education & Psychology
Ambassador College
Big Sandy, TX 75755

Karolyn J. Snyder, Ed.D.
Director, School Management Institute
College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William L. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 750

ABSTRACT

School districts have responded to the job expectations for administrators by emphasizing leadership at the principal level. Simultaneously the research community has studied effective schools to learn what principals and teachers do that influences student achievement gains. This article synthesizes the results of effective schooling characteristics that have been identified by numerous researchers. We also discuss the development of an instrument to assess administrators' training needs. Within this context, we report a synthesis of our findings into ten school-leadership competency statements. This synthesis will make possible the presentation of strategies for instructional leadership development.

LEADERSHIP FOR PRODUCTIVE SCHOOLS

The management writings that have made the best-seller lists in recent years (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Geneen, 1984; Moss-Kanter, 1983; Peters & Waterman, 1982), the generic base of management and organizational theory and research, and the studies of effective schools have all pointed to the critical role of the school principal and the principal's potential ability to alter work and achievement patterns. Accordingly, the vital function of school-based leadership and management is being examined by departments of education, professional organizations, school districts and principals themselves.

Even though the research literature corresponds with our intuitions about good schools and effective leadership (Purkey & Smith, 1985), error potential resides in merely exhorting principals to focus on school-based management and go forth and lead. In fact, most principals today are simply not prepared to meet the school's need for instructional leadership.

In effective schools administrators not only manage, they exercise instructional leadership. Management implies school maintenance; leadership means keeping sight of long-term goals and guiding the school in that direction (Rallis & Highsmith, 1986).

Before 1950 principals focused primarily on being instructional leaders. However, in post-World War II America, as schools grew larger and more complex, administrators' emphasis swung toward personnel, budget and public relations (Goodland, 1979).

This view of the educational administrator as the "corporate" chief executive officer has been modified by at least three recent trends (Bryant, 1988). One trend looks to

restructure the schools, calling for teachers to be integrated into the decision-making process of the schools. Examples include building-level participatory decision making and the utilization of lead teachers. A second trend deals with leadership styles and studies in gender difference (Statham, 1988). A third focus conceptualizes the school administrator as an instructional leader (McLaughlin, 1984). Such a view requires that the administrator attend to the instructional-learning process in addition to the management function.

Numerous studies in recent years confirm that strong instructional leaders are critical factors in effective schools. For example, a Rand study of 1977 called the principal the "gatekeeper" of change and reported that principals were powerful enough to prevent and foster any kind of change within their schools. Additionally, Edmonds (1979) and Austin (1979) concluded from their studies that instructional leadership was indeed a key to an effective school.

But how is a principal's behavior steered in the direction of instructional leadership? Outlining conceptual or methodological guidelines for accomplishing instructional leadership is especially difficult since little consensus exists among school administrators who discuss these tasks. Moreover, how do these tasks differ from what principals have always done? Current research now shows that school-improvement planning, staff-and-program development, school assessment and an understanding of culture constitute important elements in productive schools.

The purpose of our paper is threefold. First we synthesize the results of effective schooling characteristics and leadership tasks that have been identified by the research community and use this as a focus to present a model for instructional leadership. Second,

considering this empirical base of over 250 research studies of productive organizations (75%) and effective schools (25%), we discuss the development of a research instrument which we designed for school districts to use in assessing the training needs of their administrators in relation to instructional leadership. Third we studied the administrators in two large school districts in the State of Texas. Our pool of respondents (n = 247) for the study were elementary, middle and secondary school principals and central office personnel.

Research on Effective School Characteristics

School Improvement Planning

Principals and teachers in effective schools transform their common concerns into specific achievement-oriented, school-improvement goals. This team effort spawns a healthy climate and tends to create a sense of community. Purpose and order for schooling activities result from collaborative goal definitions (Armor, 1976; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Glenn, 1981; Lieberman & Miller, 1979).

Administrators of effective schools learn to group teachers creatively into working teams. When principals and teachers work as colleagues, collaborative action planning, shared decision making and cooperation result. Moreover, an interchange of ideas among teachers occurs regularly and permeates school life (Austin, 1979; Doss & Holley, 1982; Lieberman & Miller, 1979; Vallina, 1978).

Both school and teacher goals tend to guide teacher performance in successful schools. Role expectations are clear and teachers are held accountable for student performance in effective schools (California DPE, 1980; Lieberman & Miller, 1979; Phi

Delta Kappan, 1980). Representative organization planning activities would include school-wide goal planning, work group performance planning and individual staff development performance planning.

Program Development

Principals of effective schools successfully convey their system of instructional standards to teachers, as well as coordinate school-wide curriculum, instruction, and testing. These principals plan for, organize, and distribute resources to their staffs. Resource management is linked with school goals. District resources enhance the instructional program (Edmonds, 1979; Glenn & McLean, 1981; Madden, 1976).

The instructional program is adaptable and consistent in general, characterized by clear and timely instructional cues, reinforcements, correctives and feedback, and by active student participation. Teachers plan and carry out programs together, providing a climate of high achievement expectations for all students (Coulson, 1977; Edmonds, 1979; Klausemeier, 1982; Levine & Stark, 1981; Lysakowski & Walbert, 1982; Marcus, MacQueen, Duck, Lee, & Wellisch, 1976).

Further, parents and community business leaders contribute significantly to the successful school's instructional program. High levels of parent or community involvement expedite student achievement, a greater awareness of community issues, and tend to result in increased satisfaction between the school and parents (Armor, 1976; Austin, 1979; Hobson, 1976; Reagan, 1977; Vallina, 1978). Representative program development activities would include instructional program development and resources development.

Staff Development

Principals of successful schools frequently coach teachers (formally and informally) in developing instructional skills. "Effective teaching" guides supervision practices as principals and teachers improve teaching, and subsequently raise the levels of student achievement (Clausett & Gaynor, 1982; Edmonds, 1982; Levine & Stark, 1981).

School-based staff development programs tied to improvement goals mark the most effective programs. In successful schools, staff development is an essential variable to improvement efforts. Teachers and principals together identify skills that are transferable to the classroom (Levine & Stark, 1981; Lieberman & Miller, 1979; Miller & Wolf, 1978; Vanesky & Winfield, 1979).

The staff at successful schools is held accountable for its results, individually and collectively, in a supportive atmosphere (Cohen, 1981; Levine & Stark, 1981; Lieberman & Miller, 1979).

Staff development goals closely follow school goals. Workshops, planned by the staff, and subsequent teacher coaching comprise much of the development program. Instructional standards that help direct improvement and which are flexible and directed to mechanisms that foster the achievement of school goals provide the keys to the development of the school's program. The community, including parents, is involved in definable ways in the instructional program.

The most important issue for school reformers is to address how to provide the high-quality staff development that is necessary to produce effective schools (Orlich, 1989). From their review of school effectiveness studies in 35 states, Bancroft and Lezotte stated that

improvement efforts should be focused on a single school. Furthermore, establishing a building-based improvement team composed of teachers and administrators accelerates school improvement efforts, but short-term implementation plans are not successful since the implementation of school improvements takes from three to five years (Bancroft & Lezotte, 1985). Representative activities from this component include staff development, clinical supervision, work group development, and quality control.

School Assessment

In successful schools, principals develop a school-wide accountability model. Student achievement gains, work group productivity, and staff behavior and performance measure school-wide productivity. Effective schools recognize their students' accomplishments (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1982).

Team-level assessment practices that correlate with achievement have not been identified. Possibly, few assessment practices exist at the team level and therefore cannot be studied. The effect that team-level evaluation might have on team productivity, student achievement, and on overall school success may be a question worth pursuing.

Principals of successful schools review staff. High teacher morale is the chief teacher characteristic in assessing teaching in effective schools (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Coulson, 1977).

Personnel in effective schools continually evaluate student progress, and the greater the involvement of assessment by the principal the higher is student achievement. Feedback on progress is useful when standards exist for achievement and where principals have high expectations. Student academic self-concept and self-reliance tend to be high in effective

schools (Brookover & Lezzote, 1979; Clausett & Gaynor, 1982; Gigleotti & Brookover, 1975; Vallina, 1978). Interestingly, researchers report little about teacher evaluation systems which correlate to any extent with student achievement gains or with organizational success, with one exception: goal-based performance evaluation.

Representative activities from this component includes assessing student, teacher, work group, and school achievement.

Organizational Culture

The best sellers on modern management now focus on making groups more productive and on empowering them to tackle problems and challenges consistently and persistently. The concept of "corporate transformation" (Kilmann, Corwin, & Associates, 1988) has emerged to describe this current phenomenon.

From the emerging work-culture literature (Kanter, 1983) we know that culture is so powerful a force that it can either stimulate or repress performance. That is, the strength of an organization's goals and symbol systems; the quality of group sharing and networking; the patterns of reward and recognition: empowerment and entrepreneurial opportunities to shape the organization's future function as a context (work culture) that nurtures success. Indeed, every organization develops its own culture: a complex mix of implicit and explicit group values, attitudes, behaviors, rituals, standards, perceptions, and history. This work culture seems to be the social and psychological force that stimulates the direction and quality of work in an organization. This powerful, intangible force functions as a context to limit or enhance the capacity of an organization to respond to issues (Carlopio, 1988; Selman

& DiBianca, 1983). The work place can be revitalized by stimulating and managing its culture.

When Managing Productive Schools: Toward an Ecology (Snyder & Anderson, 1986) was published, the authors held certain views on school management. We believed, and still believe, that faculty involvement in the educational improvement process is a management necessity. However, the expansion of the knowledge base about organizational and human productivity over the past five years indicates that until educational leaders and support staff together assume responsibility for schooling, achievement patterns are likely to remain unchanged. The sociological management challenge is one of empowering groups to address educational productivity. The administrative challenge is one of instructional leadership and and restructuring (integrating teachers into the decision-making process of the schools). This synthesis emerges from the developing work-culture literature (Carlopio, 1988; Kanter, 1983; Kilmann, Corwin, & Associates, 1988; Levinson, 1968; Selman & DiBianca, 1983) and the instructional leadership findings mentioned previously.

Indeed, the literature on all kinds of productive organizations continues to affirm clearly and strongly that employee involvement in shaping the organization's direction is essential to the very survival of the organization. Opportunity, information and resources are the vital materials that fuel organizational productivity (Johnson and Snyder, 1989-1990). A typical management structure might divide the school year into three parts: planning (September and October), development (November through April), and evaluation (May and June).

Methodology

Considering this empirical base of over 400 research studies of productive organizations (75%) and effective schools (25%) (Snyder & Anderson, 1986; Snyder (1988), we sought to measure the existing training needs for principals and district personnel vis a vis the model. Consequently, a needs assessment instrument was developed.

The number of school personnel surveyed in the pilot testing of the instrument was determined by having at least five times as many respondents as try out questions on the instrument (Lemke & Wiersma, 1976: Nunnally, 1970). We conducted a survey of 442 school administrators in eight districts of Arizona, Kansas, Missouri, North Carolina and Texas.

The construction and field testing of an instrument involves the following steps: (a) development of a pool of instrument questions, (b) development of questionnaire forms, (c) selection of administrative personnel to respond to the instrument, (d) actual administration of the instrument and (e) writing computer programs for the reliability and validity assessments of the instrument.

The questions were written using the standard domain-sampling model supported by Nunnally (1967) and Cronbach (1970). Initial questions addressing the seven areas to be assessed were written, scrutinized, and studied. Next, the pool of items was expanded. Finally, the questions were rewritten and revised. These final revisions produced the pool of items contained in the instrument.

An instrument form employing a Likert format was developed for the pool of items. Lemon (1973) wrote that much of the experimental research pertaining to attitude change

involves measuring attitudes by a simple, easily administered instrument, usually a rating-scale format, and then attributing changes or differences in the ratings to experimental manipulations. In this context, the Likert scale of summative ratings is the most widely used attitude measure in current research. Gronland (1976) stated that Likert's approach to attitude scaling was less time consuming in development than earlier methods such as Thurston's and Remmers'. Borg and Gall (1974) identified the Likert technique as the easiest method presently available for developing scales needed in attitude research.

McGinnies (1970) clarified the procedures involved in constructing a Likert scale. The first step involves the writing of a number of statements dealing with the topic under investigation. Respondents then indicate their reaction to each question on an interval scale. Severy (1974) added that it is assumed when a Likert scale is developed that all written questions reflect the same attitudinal dimensions. Advantages of the Likert scale are: (1) that construction is less time consuming and easier than are other scaling techniques, and (2) that fewer items are required to obtain higher correlation coefficients (Ahmann & Glock, 1975; Borg & Gall, 1974; Gronland, 1976; Lemon, 1973; Shaw & Wright, 1967).

Shaw and Wright (1967) wrote that items should be written in simple and clear language, should contain a single idea, and should be unambiguous. Borg and Gall (1974) noted that an instrument dealing with attitudes would generally be constructed as an attitude scale and should include at least ten items to obtain a valid picture of the attitude concerned. Tittle and Hill (1967) investigated the predictive efficiency of four frequently used attitude measurement techniques in terms of predicting indices of voter behavior. The Thurston, Guttman, Likert and semantic differential scales were compared. The Likert scale

was superior to all other scales in predictive validity. Their evidence suggested that in cases where the Likert and Thurston scales were of equal length, the Likert scale exhibited higher reliability.

Two Column Instrument Scale Descriptors

Often, for the first version of the instrument, a two column quasi-Likert response form will be chosen because of it applicability in general or first-time assessment trials (Johnson & Dixon, 1984; Witkin, 1977). Discrepancy as defined by Tyler (1949) is understood to mean a difference between some standard of value and an actual status. Sarthory (1977) defined a need as a quantifiable gap in attitude, achievement, or performance between the ideal and the real.

Kaufman (1972) and Southard (1974) identified the four specific components in a discrepancy needs assessment procedure: (a) determine desired conditions, (b) determine existing conditions, (c) analyze discrepancies between the actual and desired conditions, and (d) assign priorities to the discrepancies. These discrepancies constitute indices of need.

Pertaining to the discrepancy format, respondents rated specific statements on two five-point quasi-Likert scales: (a) perception of the degree to which the situation <u>actually</u> exists and (b) perception of the extent to which the situation is <u>desired</u> to exist. The discrepancy between the two scale values, for a specific question, in referred to as the need index.

The discrepancy format response mode included the following two column response categories: (a) <u>competence</u> (consisting of the following scale): 1 = no knowledge of; 2 = knowledge of; 3 = worked with; 4 = extensive work with; 5 = expertise in; and (b) <u>training</u>

(consisting of the following scale): 1 = desire no training, skill unrelated; 2 = desire no training, competency high; 3 = desire awareness session; 4 = desire training; and 5 = desire further training. The competency column is the actual status while the training column is the desired status. Jenkins and Taber (1977) found in an agree/disagree context that the number of response categories above five did not, in any situation, yield a significant increase in Likert discriminability. McKelvie (1978) proposed using five or six categories. He further suggested that there was no psychometric advantage in a large number of scale categories and, on the other hand, that discriminative power and validity may be reduced when fewer than five categories are used. Ramsey (1973) studied the effect of the number of categories in rating scales on the precision of scale values estimated by maximum likelihood techniques and concluded that using seven or more categories provides very nearly as much precision of estimate as a corresponding task requiring continuous judgment. Neumann and Neumann (1981) concluded from their research that the five-point scale appears to be the most convenient to use in attitudinal surveys. The literature suggestions are frequent favoring a five- or six-point scale for the Likert format (Johnson, 1990).

Two-Column Instrument Form

An introductory paragraph in the instrument explained the purpose of instrument distribution. It stated that the authors were gathering information pertaining to the principals' knowledge of various instructional-leadership skills and their desire for training. Immediately following were directions pertaining to the completion of the instrument and definitions of the terms used. It was our intent to limit the length and complexity of the

instrument so the 90% of the participants could complete the instrument in 30 minutes or less (Cronbach, 1970).

Two-Column Instrument Results

A sample of about 200 administrative personnel, such as principals, assistant principals, superintendents, assistant superintendents, supervisors, or curriculum directors, responded to the two column instrument.

Specifically, we found that administrative practitioners were unfamiliar with the scoring technique (a correlated t test was used to calculate the need index). The literature of statistical procedures is replete, however, with descriptions of and derivations for this procedure (Hicks, 1973; Hinkle & Wiersma, 1979; Kerlinger, 1973; Kirk, 1968). Finding this unfamiliarity with scoring technique, the next instrument version was changed to a one column "desire training" format.

One-Column Instrument Scale Descriptors

The discrepancy format was changed to a one-column format with the following descriptors: (a) no training (skill unrelated), (b) no training (competency high), (c) training (awareness level), (d) training (initial practice), (e) training (skill refinement), and (f) assistance with school implementation. In constructing the response columns for the scale, the attempt was made to reflect equidistant order in the six categories. In the continuum from "no training (skill unrelated)" to "assistance with school implementation," the categories were ordered.

There is the question of a metric base for the variables. Stevens (1946) wrote that factor analysis requires the variables be measured on at least an interval level. This

requirement is implied by the use of correlation or covariance matrices as the basic input to factor analysis. If it were argued that the scaling used was not absolutely of a metric base, would a researcher always avoid factor analysis? Kim and Mueller (1978) have written that such is not necessarily so. Many variables, such as measure of attitudes and opinions, do not have a clearly established metric base. Furthermore, it is generally assumed that many ordinal variables may be given numeric values without distorting the underlying properties. The final answer to the question of applying multi-variate analysis to a nonmetric variable base really hinges on two considerations: (1) how well the arbitrarily assigned numbers reflect the underlying true distances, and (2) the amount of distortion introduced in the correlation procedures (which become the basic input to factor analysis) by the distortions of scaling. Fortunately, the correlation coefficients are fairly robust with respect to ordinal distortions in measurement (Kim, 1975; Labovitz, 1967, 1970). Hence, as long as one can assume that the distortions introduced by assigning numeric values to ordinal categories are not very substantial, treating ordinal variables as if they are metric variables can be justified (Kim & Mueller, 1978). The scale descriptions were written to reflect as near a metric base as possible. It was felt the distortions were minimal and the application of factor analysis to the data would be consistent with factor analytic models used in instrument development.

One-Column, Likert Instrument

The instrument was constructed to assess principal training desires in seven specified areas: (a) the principalship; (b) the school system; (c) problem solving; (d) staff development; (e) collaborative long range planning; (f) planning for school growth; and (g) personal awareness.

These subscales and a brief content description of each follows. First was the *principalship* consisting of questions embracing the perspectives of leadership, planning, organizing, motivating organizational behavior, and controlling. Next was the topic of the *school as an ecological system*. Questions addressed the environmental suprasystem as well as the goal, psychosocial, structural, technical, and management subsystems.

The third subscale was *problem solving* focusing on real school organizational problems from the perspective of roles, communication skills, and problem solving steps. Next was *planning for school growth*, which focused on the principal's varied tasks such as action planning and force field analysis.

The fifth subscale addressed was *staff development* encompassing clinical supervision, in-service training, and evaluation. The sixth subscale was *collaborative long range planning* for school improvement which included goal setting, resource assessment, program planning, implementation and monitoring functions, and evaluation procedures. Finally, there was a *personal awareness* subscale embracing the perspectives of personality characteristics, self-concept, and administrative-style effectiveness. The questions were then randomly assigned to the instrument.

Sampling Procedures for the Instrument

The number of cases used in the instrument validation was 442. This number was arrived at by having at least five times as many subjects as try-outs items (Lemke & Wiersma, 1976; Nunnally, 1970). The respondents were elementary, middle, junior high, and secondary principals and assistant principals, superintendents and assistant superintendents,

supervisors and curriculum directors from school districts in Arizona, Kansas, Missouri, North Carolina, and Texas.

Final Scale Analysis of the One-Column Instrument

The collected pool of data was submitted to factor and subscale analyses (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). Instrument validity was established by two methods. First, content validity involves essentially the systematic examination of the scale content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the domain to be measured (Anastasi, 1976; Ebel, 1956; Huddleston, 1956; Lennon, 1956). Representative selection of items and sensible test construction are cited by Nunnally (1967) as the standard means of ensuring content validity.

The content validity of the instrument was established therefore in the following manner: each subscale area was reviewed and questions were written which were believed to be representative of the behaviors, attitudes, or characteristics to be measured.

Next, construct validity was established. The construct validity of a test is the extent to which the test may be said to measure a theoretical construct or trait (Anastasi, 1976). Essential to the notion of construct validity is the internal consistency of the items (Nunnally, 1967). Of particular relevance to construct validity is factor analysis. Lemke and Wiersma (1976) have defined factor analysis as the refined technique for analyzing the interrelationship of behavior data, simplifying the description of data by reducing the number of necessary variables or dimensions (Anastasi, 1976; Kim & Mueller, 1978).

Nunnally (1976) noted that some researchers refer to construct validity as "factorial validity." Furthermore, factor analysis is an attractive method for evaluating validity because it focuses on the reliable components of collected data (Gorsuch, 1983). Thompson (1989) noted that the "common variance" represented by indices of association tended to represent reliable variance, and since it is from these indices that factors are extracted, it follows that factors tend to be constructed from the "true score" components of variables.

Determining the number of factors to extract from the correlation matrix is a fundamental decision in any analysis (Thompson & Borrello, 1986). Many researchers follow the recommendations of Guttman (1954) and extract all factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Other researchers feel the Scree test is superior to other methods for determining the number of factors to extract (Cattell, 1965; Linn, 1968; Tucker, Koopman & Linn, 1969). These two methods have now been rigorously studied, and most of the leaders in factor analysis favor the Scree test.

Using principal components analysis (Stevens, 1986) followed by varimax rotation (since the correlations between the various factors were low), the initial factors were reduced to seven. Scale items were retained in the instrument only if they had a factor loading greater than or equal to 0.30. The rule often used in this context is to consider factor loading less than 0.30 as not substantial (Gorsuch, 1983; Kim and Mueller, 1978). The original 76 questions were hypothesized to be contained in seven subscales, and this number of subscales was confirmed in the varimax rotated factor matrix.

Fifty items were retained in the instrument following the elimination of 26 items suggested as inappropriate by the factor analysis. These 50 items grouped into seven

meaningful components: problem solving (five questions); personal awareness (six questions); staff development (five questions); planning (19 questions); goal setting (six questions); the school as a system (five questions); and the principalship (five questions).

Evaluation of the reliability of the instrument was accomplished through use of the Kuder-Richardson generalized reliability formula, coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951; Ebel, 1965; Novick & Lewis, 1967). This formula was appropriate since a Likert scaling format was employed in the instrument form.

The Cronbach alphas for these subscales follow: problem solving (.82), personal awareness (.86), staff development (.82), planning (.94), the school as a system (.76), the principalship (.82), and goal setting (.82). Anastasi (1976) has posited that it is desirable for reliability coefficients to fall in the range of .80 or .90.

Findings and Discussion

Given the problems of conducting administrative research in school districts, we contacted the district administrators in two large school systems in the State of Texas, where we were working in a variety of training and consulting capacities. The elementary, middle and secondary school principals and central office personnel who responded to our study reported that they desired training in all categories, with the desires ranging between awareness (category 3) and initial practice (category 4). Table 1 outlines the specific training preferences for all the administrators surveyed. New knowledge and skills in all categories are perceived as important to the administrators' role success. A response range of 1 (low) to 6 (high) was possible.

The principalship emerged as the area of greatest interest and concern. Last in rank was the school as a system which was the category describing the school's ecology and the many organizational factors which work interdependently to influence achievement results. While all seven categories are distinct from each other, each seemed to represent and be of concern to principals in providing effective instructional leadership.

We can report that those studied perceive that the task dimensions surveyed are a desirable focus for their own professional development. Furthermore, the skills necessary for successful collaboration, organizational assessment and analysis, and a knowledge of how personal characteristics influence leadership all appear to be important to the administrators for the successful implementation of instructional leadership tasks.

Each school district and professional organization needs to devote priority attention to these needs in particular, augmenting workshops on what teachers can do. Furthermore, peer supervision and coaching, and peer efforts to develop and implement new skills in the classroom benefit the school system. A feedback mechanism of some sort is essential to the eventual successful development of expertise in instructional leadership. Considering the synthesis of our research and training with thousands of principals, we will now report ten school leadership competency statements. This synthesis will make possible the presentation of strategies for instructional leadership development.

Organizational Planning Cluster

1. School-Wide Goal Setting: Establish annual school development goals through administrative assessment and selection and also through total staff collaborative decision making.
2. Work Group Performance: Designate school work groups, both teaching teams or department and task forces, to which are assigned school goal objectives and action planning responsibilities.
3. Individual Staff Performance: Establish and operationalize a teacher performance system that includes performance standards, individual goal setting and action planning procedures, performance monitoring, due process procedures, and evaluation.

Staff Leadership Cluster

4. Staff Development: Develop an operationalize a school program for staff growth that emphasizes new knowledge and skills that are necessary for successful attainment of school development goals (school, work, individual).
5. Clinical Supervision: Develop and operationalize a peer and supervisory clinical supervision program for all teachers and teams, where performance feedback and correctives are provided weekly.
6. Work Group Development: Establish a healthy work climate and develop work group skills in action planning, creative and productive group

communications, problem solving, and decision making. (This competency area resulted from our research analysis).

7. Quality Control: Establish and operationalize a quality control system for work groups and individuals which includes goal-based observations, conferencing, periodic progress reports and plans, and conferencing and supervisory plans.

Program Leadership Cluster

8. Instructional Program: Establish and operationalize an instructional program that reflects up-to-date research on teaching and learning, and guides the teaching improvement efforts in the following areas: curriculum implementation, student diagnosis and placement, program planning, classroom management, teaching, and learning.

9. Resource Development: Facilitate staff productivity in work groups and provide necessary resources for making the school an increasingly productive unit.

Assessing Achievement Cluster

10. Evaluation: Establish and operationalize a set of school evaluation procedures to assess student achievement gains, teaching team and task force productivity, individual teacher performance, and total school productivity.

Summary and Conclusion

Educational administration is changing from an emphasis on just administering policy to a focus on leading instructional improvement efforts. Principals want the skills necessary to become successful instructional leaders.

Our study of principals reinforces our observations: because of a redefinition of the principalship, principals themselves are faced with a need for new job knowledge and skills. Further, principals want training in the elements of annual school-wide, team-level and individual teacher planning, coaching, and evaluation. In addition, they want skills for designing successful staff development programs, providing on-the-job teacher coaching, monitoring performance and program development, implementation, and evaluation. Moreover, in addition to the tasks of instructional leadership, principals also want to know how to involve others successfully in cooperative planning and action.

The message for role development is clear: if principals are expected to perform new tasks and accomplish different kinds of performance results from that for which they were trained, their development in a new set of knowledge and skills must become a district priority. Moreover, our own experiences cause us not only to report those findings of what principals say they want but also to challenge school administrators to foster skill development by combining initial training in instructional leadership tasks with continuous on-the-job peer and supervisory coaching. If we expect principals to help transform our schools, we owe it to them to provide the necessary knowledge, skills, and support for their success.

Table 1
Ranking (High to Low) of the Need Indices for the Instructional Leadership Surveys
(All Educational Leaders n = 247)

Rank	Area	Need Index
1	**The Principalship** (questions relating to instructional leadership expectations)	3.774
2	**Problem Solving** (questions relating cooperative decision-making)	3.723
3	**Staff Development** (questions relating to clinical supervision, training and teacher evaluation)	3.687
4	**Planning for School Growth** (questions relating to organizational analysis and school leadership planning)	3.677
5	**Personal Awareness** (questions relating to the leader's self-concept, personality, leadership style and their influence on instructional leadership behaviors)	3.670
6	**Long Range Planning** (questions relating to cooperative goal setting and action planning, monitoring and evaluation)	3.521
7	**School as a System** (questions relating to school goals, organization, performance, program, technology and management, how together these guide the school improvement process)	3.490

References

Ahmann, J.S.,& Glock, M.D. (1975). **Evaluating pupil growth.** Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Anastasi, A. (1976). **Psychological testing** (4th ed.) New York: Macmillan.

Armor, D. (1976). **Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools.** Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation (ED 130 243).

Austin, G.R. (1979, October). Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. **Educational Leadership,** 37, 10-14.

Bancroft, B.A.,& Lezotte, L.W. (1985). Growing use of effective schools model for school improvement. **Educational Leadership,** 42, 23-27.

Borg, W.R.,& Gall, M. (1974). **Educational research.** New York: David McKay Company.

Brookover, W.B., & Lezotte, L.W. (1979). **Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement.** East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 005).

Bryant, M.T. (1988). An inquiry-based orientation for preparation programs in educational administration. **National FORUM of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal,** 6, 1, 70-80.

California State Department of Education. (1980). **Report on special studies of selected ECE Schools with increasing and decreasing reading scores.** Sacramento, CA: Office of Program Evaluation and Research.

Carlopio, J. (1988). "Make a Difference: Break Through Your Organizational Limits." **Organizational Development Journal,** 6, 3, 46-50.

Cattell, R.B. (1965). Factor analysis: an introduction to essentials (I) the purpose and underlying models, (II) the role of factor analysis in research. **Biometrics,** 21, 190-215, 405-435.

Clausett, K.H., & Gaynor, A.K. (1982, December). A systems perspective on effective schools. **Educational Leadership,** 40, 54-59.

Cohen, M. (1981, April/May). Effective schools: What research says. **Today's Education,** p. 48-G.

Coulson, J.E. (1977, July). **Overview of the National Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act.** Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation (ED 154 951).

Cronbach, J.E. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. **Psychometrika,** 16, 3, 297-334.

Cronbach, L.J. (1970). **Essentials of psychological testing.** New York: MacMillan.

Deal, T.E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). **Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life.** Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Doss, D., & Holley, F. (1982). **A cause for national pause: Title I school side projects.** Austin, TX: Office of Research and Evaluation, Austin Independent School District, ORE Publication No. 81.55.

Ebel, R.L. (1956). Obtaining and reporting evidence on content validity. **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** 16, 3, 169-282.

Ebel, R.L. (1965). **Measuring educational achievement.** Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Edmonds, R.R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. **Educational Leadership** 37, 15-23.

Edmonds, R.R. (December 1982). Programs for school improvement: An overview. **Educational Leadership.** 40, 4-11.

Geneen, H., with Moscow, A. (1984). **Managing.** Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday.

Gigleotti, J., & Brookover, W.B. (1975). The learning environment: A comparison of high and low achieving elementary schools. **Urban Education,** 10, 256-257.

Glenn, B.C. (1981). **What works? An examination of effective schools for poor black children.** Cambridge: Harvard University, Center for Law and Education.

Goodlad, J.I. (1979). **What are schools for?** Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Gorsuch, R.L. (1983). **Factor analysis.** Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Gronland, N.E. (1976). **Measurement and evaluation in teaching.** New York: MacMillan.

Guttman, L. (1954). Some necessary conditions for common factor analysis. **Psychometrika,** 19, 149-161.

Hicks, C.R. (1973). **Fundamental concepts in the design of experiments.** New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hinkle, D.E., & Wiersma, W. (1979). **Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences.**

Hobson, P.J. (1976). **Structured parental involvement: An analysis of a Title I summer parent guided AT HOME project.** Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, pp. 80-81.

Huddleston, E.M. (1956). Test development on the basis of content validity. **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** 16, 3, 283-293.

Jenkins, G.D., & Taber, T.D. (1977). A Monte Carlo study of factors affecting three indices of composite scale reliability. **Journal of Applied Psychology,** 62, 392-398.

Johnson, W.L. (1990). Factorial structure of the Charles F. Kettering Climate Profile. **Psychological Reports,** 67, 67-74.

Johnson, W.L. & Dixon, P.N. (1984). Response alternatives in Likert scaling. **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** 44, 563-567.

Johnson, W.L., & Snyder, K.J. (1989-1990). "Planning for faculty development in America's colleges." **National FORUM of Applied Educational Research Journal** 2, 1, 34-38.

Kanter, R.M. (1983). **The change masters: Innovation for productivity in the American corporation.** New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kaufman, R.A. (1972). **Educational system planning.** Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kerlinger F.N. (1973). **Foundations of Behavioral Research.** New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kilmann, R.H., Corwin, T.J., & Associates. (1988). **Corporate transformation: Revitalizing organizations for a competitive world.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kim, J.O. (1975). Multivariate analysis of ordinal variables. **American Journal of Sociology,** 81, 261-298.

Kim, J.O., & Mueller, C.W. (1978). **Factor analysis.** Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Kirk, R. (1968). **Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences.** Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Klausemeier, H.J. (1982, September). "A research strategy for educational improvement." **Educational Digest**, 48, 1, 19-22.

Labovitz, S. (1967). Some observations on measurement and statistics. **Social Forces**, 46, 151-160.

Labovitz, S. (1970). The assignments of Numbers to Rank order categories. **American Sociological Review**, 35, 515-524.

Lemke, E., & Wiersma, W. (1976). **Principles of psychological measurement**. Chicago, IL: Houghton-Mifflin.

Lemon, N. (1973). **Attitudes and their measurement**. London: B.T. Batsford.

Lennon, R.T. (1956). Assumptions underlying the use of content validity. **Educational and Psychological Measurement**, 16, 3, 294-304.

Levine, D.U., & Stark, J. (1981, August). **Extended summary and conclusions: Institutional and organizational arrangements and processes for improving academic achievement at inner city elementary schools**. (mimeo) Kansas City, MO: University of Missouri-Kansas City, School of Education, Center for the study of Metropolitan Problems in Education.

Levinson, H. (1968). **The exceptional executive: A psychological conception**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1979). Introduction to **Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives**. New York: Teachers College Press.

Linn, R.L. (1968). A Monte Carlo approach to the number of factors problem. **Psychometrika**, 33, 37-71.

Lysakowski, R.S., & Walberg, H.J. (1982, Winter). "Instructional effects of cues, participation and corrective feedback: A quantitative synthesis." **American Educational Research Journal**, 19, 559-578.

Madden, J.V. (1976). **School effectiveness study: State of California**. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA Convention, San Francisco, CA.

Marcus, A.C., MacQueen, A.H., Duck, G.A., Lee, R.D., & Wellisch, J.B. (1976, April 14-16). **Administrative leadership in a sample of successful schools from the National Evaluation of the Emergency School**. System Development Corporation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA Convention, San Francisco, CA.

McGinnies, E. (1970). **Social behavior: A functional analysis.** Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

McKelvie, S.G. (1978). Graphic rating scales: How many categories. **British Journal of Psychology**, 69, 185-202.

McLaughlin, M. (1984). "Teacher evaluation and school improvement." **Teachers College Record**, 86, 1.

Miller, L., & Wolf, T. (1978). Staff development for school change: Theory and practice. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (eds.), **Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives** (pp. 144-160). New York: Teachers College Press.

Neumann L., & Neumann, Y. (1981). Comparison of six lengths of rating scales: students' attitudes toward instruction. **Psychological Reports**, 48, 399-404.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. (1975). **Statistical package for the social sciences.** New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Novick, M.R., & Lews, C. (1967). Coefficient alpha and the reliability of composite measurements. **Psychometrika**, 32, 1, 1-13.

Nunnally, J.C. (1967). **Psychometric theory**. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J.C. (1970). **Introduction to psychological measurement**. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Orlich, D.C. (1989, March). Education reforms: Mistakes, misconceptions, miscues. **Phi Delta Kappan**, 70, 7, 512-517.

Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H. (1982). **In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies**. New York: Harper & Row.

Phi Delta Kappan. (1980). **Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa study of exceptional urban elementary schools**. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. (1985, June). **Effective schools: A review**. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.

Rallis, S.F. & Highsmith, M.C. (1986, December). The myth of the "Great Principal": Questions of school management and instructional leadership. **Phi Delta Kappan**, 68, 300-304.

Ramsey, J.O. (1973). The effect of number of categories in rating scales on precision of estimation of scale values. **Psychometrika,** 38, 513-532.

Rand Corporation. (1979). **Organized teachers in the American schools.** Santa Monica, California: Rand Publications.

Reagan, B. (1977, December). Cited in Joseph M. Cronin, Parents and educators: Mutual allies. **Phi Delta Kappan,** p. 243.

Sarthory, J.A. (1977). Needs assessment and the practitioner: Problems and prospects. **Educational Technology,** 17, 24-26.

Selman, J., & DiBianca, V.E. (1983). "Contextual management: Applying the art of dealing creatively with change." **Management Review** 72, 9, 13-19.

Severy, L.J. (1974). **Procedure and issues in the measurement of attitudes.** Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 426).

Shaw, M.E. & Wright, J.M. (1967). **Scales for the measurement of attitudes.** New York: McGraw-Hill.

Snyder, K.J. & Anderson, R.H. (1986). **Managing productive schools: Toward an ecology.** San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich, Inc.

Snyder, K.J. (1988). **Managing productive schools.** San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich, Inc.

Southard, M. (1974). **A framework for evaluating needs assessment models.** Unpublished manuscript, Florida State University-Tallahassee, FL.

Statham, A. (1988). The gender model revisited: Differences in the management styles of men and women. **Sex Roles** 16, 7/8.

Stevens, J. (1986). **Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences.** Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Stevens, S.S. (1946). On the theory of scales measurement. **Science,** 103, 677-680.

Thompson, B. (1989). Meta-analysis of factor structures: a case study example with Bem's androgyny measure. **Journal of Experimental Education,** 57, 187-197.

Thompson, B., & Borrello, G.M. (1986). Second-order factor structure of the MBTI: a construct validity assessment. **Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development**, 18, 148-153.

Tittle, C.R., & Hill, R.E.J. (1967). Attitude measurement and prediction of behavior: An evaluation of conditions and measurement techniques. **Sociometry**, 30, 2, 199-213.

Tucker, L.R., Koopman, R.F., & Linn, R.L. (1969). Evaluation of factor analytic research procedures by means of simulated correlation matrices. **Psychometrika**, 34, 421-459.

Tyler, R. (1949). **Basic principles of curriculum and instruction**. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Vallina, S.A. (1978). Analysis of observed critical task performance of Title I-ESEA principals of Illinois. Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University, pp. 156-166.

Vanesky, R.I., & Winfield, L.F. (1979). **Schools that succeed beyond expectation on reading** (Studies on Educational Technology, Report No. 1). Newark: University of Delaware.

Witkin, B.R. (1977). Needs assessment kits, models, and tools. **Educational Technology**, 17, 4-18.